

REMARKS

The Office Action dated December 17, 2003 has been received and carefully considered. The above amendments and the following remarks are being submitted as a full and complete response to the Office Action.

Before addressing the prior art rejections, essential features of the invention, as now set forth in the amended claims, shall first be discussed.

The present invention relates to an advertising system, which places advertisements, especially job or help wanted advertisements, on a display of a computer via a network communications system. In particular, the invention concerns an advertising system, which is capable of balancing the degree of specificity of geographical areas for help wanted advertisements and the number of advertisements being displayed, in accordance with content of the advertisements. To achieve this aim, before the advertisements are stored in a database, the advertisement areas are gradually fractionalized into increasingly more specific geographic regions (see, FIG. 2). Hence, help wanted advertisements can be categorized according to varying levels of geographic fractionalization and area sections within the levels, and further categorized according to the content thereof. Accordingly, help wanted advertisements for which there are numerous entries, for example, non-skilled positions for waitresses or bartenders, are classified and displayed according to more specific geographic regions (i.e., higher levels of geographic fractionalization), so that the advertisements to be

viewed are fewer in number. By contrast, advertisements for skilled positions are classified and displayed according to broader geographic regions (i.e., lower levels of geographic fractionalization), so that several advertisements can be viewed across a larger geographic area. In any case, an appropriate number of advertisements is made available for viewing, independent of the specialization of the field in which job hunting activities are conducted.

Claims 1 to 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Wachtfogel et al.

It is respectfully submitted that the cited reference does not disclose or suggest any technique for storing advertisements, which prior to storing are categorized according to "levels of geographic fractionalization" and "area sections within the levels" as set forth in the amended claims.

Wachtfogel et al. discloses a method for displaying commercials for products and services, wherein the commercials are stored for delayed viewing. Various criteria are referred to for deciding whether to store a commercial, whether to select a commercial to be made available for viewing, and whether or not to currently display the commercial. However, none of these criteria have anything to do with categorizing advertisements within different levels of geographic fractionalization, as presently claimed.

The Examiner refers several times to paragraph [0174] of the cited reference. More specifically, according to Wachtfogel

et al., the criteria used for determining whether or not to store an advertisement for delayed viewing are as follows:

- (1) a predetermined preference of the user for an item being advertised in the commercial;
- (2) a previous purchase of an item being advertised in the commercial; and
- (3) correspondence of at least one characteristic associated with the commercial to user profile data.

None of the above storage criteria relate to the claimed features of providing advertisement areas that are fractionalized into increasingly more specific geographic regions, wherein the advertisements are categorized for storage according to levels of geographic fractionalization and area sections within such levels. On the contrary, the above features simply relate to whether a user would be predisposed to viewing a particular commercial. There is no categorization of advertisements within levels of geographic fractionalization, so as to enable an appropriate number of advertisements to be made accessible to a user depending on the content of advertisements selected for viewing. Accordingly the storing steps according to Wachtfogel et al. are not similar or equivalent to the means for storing set forth in amended claim 1.

In addition, although not directly concerned with criteria for deciding whether to store an advertisement, Wachtfogel et al. further discloses determining whether or not to select a stored advertisement based upon at least one of the following criteria:

- (1) a number of times the commercial has already been displayed to the user;

- (2) a number of times other commercials advertising the same item have already been displayed to the user;
- (3) a type of product advertised in the commercial;
- (4) an event currently being viewed;
- (5) an offer induced by metadata;
- (6) a relationship to other commercials;
- (7) a predetermined date; and
- (8) a position of the commercial in a sequence of teaser commercials.

Finally, Wachtfogel et al. discloses determining whether or not to currently display the commercial based upon at least one of the following:

- (1) metadata associated with content displayed to the user, which indicates when a potential commercial occurs;
- (2) a required frequency of a commercial break;
- (3) a time of day;
- (4) a time window during which the broadcast commercial is valid;
- (5) analysis of an event;
- (6) a request from the user; and
- (7) an indication from the user that he has viewed enough.

However, similar to the criteria for storing commercials, the criteria for determining whether to select a stored advertisement, and the criteria for determining whether to currently display the commercial, are not suggestive of any steps for providing advertisement areas that are fractionalized into increasingly more specific geographic regions, or of categorizing

advertisements for storage according to levels of geographic fractionalization, as now claimed.

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the claimed invention is not anticipated and would not have been obvious to a person skilled in the art at the time the present invention was made.

No fees are due. Notwithstanding, should it be deemed that fees, or deficiencies in fees, are required in connection with this or any accompanying communication, such amounts may be charged to the Attorney's Deposit Account No. 07-2519.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul A. Guss
Reg. No. 33,099
Attorney for Applicants

CS-37-010822

775 S. 23rd St. #2
Arlington, VA 22202
Tel. 703-486-2710